1 2

3

45

6

7

8

9

10

11

KELLY SHIPLEY,

v.

COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

RELIASTAR LIFE INSURANCE

Defendant.

12

13

14

15

16

10

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 1:22-cv-00819-ADA-SAB

ORDER RE STIPULATION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST DEFENDANT, DEEMING COMPLAINT AMENDED

(ECF No. 13)

On September 20, 2023, the parties filed a stipulation agreeing to dismiss Plaintiff's second cause of action for insurance bad faith against Defendant with prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(ii). (ECF No. 13.) All other causes of action will remain active. (Id.)

The Ninth Circuit has held that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1) cannot be used to dismiss individual claims against defendants, and that Rule 15 is the proper mechanism to do so. See Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 687 (9th Cir. 2005) ("In the specific context of Rule 41(a)(1), we have held that the Rule does not allow for piecemeal dismissals. Instead, withdrawals of individual claims against a given defendant are governed by [Rule 15]."); Ethridge v. Harbor House Rest., 861 F.2d 1389, 1392 (9th Cir. 1988) (holding a plaintiff cannot use Rule 41 "to dismiss, unilaterally, a single claim from a multi-claim complaint."); but see Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997) ("The

Case 1:22-cv-00819-ADA-SAB Document 14 Filed 09/21/23 Page 2 of 2

Plaintiff may dismiss some or all of the defendants, or some or all of his claims, through a Rule 41(a)(1) notice."). The Court finds it proper to construe the parties' stipulation to dismiss the individual cause of action as consent to amend the complaint under Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Hells Canyon Pres. Council, 403 F.3d at 689 ("The fact that a voluntary dismissal of a claim under Rule 41(a) is properly labeled an amendment under Rule 15 is a technical, not a substantive distinction.") (quoting Nilssen v. Motorola, Inc., 203 F.3d 782, 784 (Fed. Cir. 2000)). Therefore, the Court will give full effect to the parties' stipulation through a Rule 15 amendment.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the Plaintiff's complaint is DEEMED AMENDED and the second cause of action is no longer alleged against Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **September 21, 2023**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE